

**HISTORIC DISTRICT COMMISSION  
MINUTES OF MEETING  
NOVEMBER 2, 2011**

**PRESENT:** William Moonan, Chair; Carol Carlson; Kevin Latady; Lorrie Dunham

**ABSENT:** Karen Kalil-Brown, Clerk; Alan Long

**BUSINESS MEETING:**

**October 5 Minutes**

Mr. Moonan asked whether the other Historic District Commission (HDC) members had read the minutes of the October 5 meeting. The other members confirmed that they had. Mr. Moonan called for a motion to approve the minutes.

Ms. Carlson moved to approve the minutes of the October 5, 2011 meeting, as corrected.

Mr. Latady seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Moonan, Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Abstained: None

The motion carried unanimously, 4-0-0.

**PRESENTATION:** Ms. Carlson read the notice of the hearing.

**PETITION #002-12** – Pamela Brown, Esq., will discuss proposed architectural modifications to the Blake Block arising out of construction level drawings at 68-84 Great Road, including door and window placement, removal of east end balcony and changes to the pattern of brick.

Jonathan Cocker, the architect for the Blake Block project, introduced himself and reminded the Commission that there were four items at last month's business meeting that were not entirely clear and that the Commission wanted some clarification on. He handed out a packet (see attachment) with a revised cover letter that lists these particular items in more detail, along with exhibits to further clarify.

***Item #1***

Mr. Cocker explained that the first item concerns "Element 3 Rear" of the Blake Block building, in which the two approved windows will be replaced with three windows, so that the residential area can have two windows to allow more light. He noted that the window on the first floor will be complemented on the opposite side by the community bulletin board; in the off-chance that the bulletin board is decided against, a window would go in its place to keep the symmetry. He said they also propose an awning over the doorway to call attention to the residential entrance area.

There was discussion, both with the Commission and with the members of the public in attendance, about this change.

At this time, Mr. Moonan explained that he had another meeting that he had to attend upstairs, in his capacity as Selectman liaison. He apologized for the absence and said that he felt comfortable having the remaining members vote on the items before the Commission, and appointed Mr. Latady as Chairman pro-tem.

Mr. Latady asked whether the bulletin board would be covered to protect it from the elements. Mr. Cocker said it will have either a glass or Plexiglas covering.

Mr. Cocker talked more with the public about the details of the change.

Ms. Carlson said she thinks this change looks much better than what was originally proposed. The other Commission members agreed.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Carlson moved to approve changes to Item #1 of the cover letter signed on October 25, 2011, as shown on the "Element 3 Rear" sketch marked as Exhibit A, whereby the door will have sidelights and bulletin board as shown, with either glass or Plexiglas covering the bulletin board. An awning will be extended over bulletin board as shown. This change also includes three windows on the second floor.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Absent: None

The motion carried unanimously, 3-0-0.

***Item #2***

Mr. Cocker stated that the second item on the cover letter references Element 4 on the front of the building, which is the brick curved corner. He said that the original approval included two layer soldier course brick, but with the soldier coursing underneath the upper story windows, the windows appear too tall. He said they propose to remove the soldier course underneath the upper windows and use a running bond pattern instead, so that the windows with pre-cast heads and sills become the visual statement in the elevation. Mr. Cocker said he proposes this change because the windows, as approved, look out of proportion for a traditional "factory-style" window. Mr. Latady agreed that this change makes sense, architecturally.

The Commission and architect talked with the public about the new aesthetics of the windows.

Ms. Dunham said she liked this proposal better than the original. The other members agreed that there were no issues with this change.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Carlson moved to approve Item #2 of the cover letter signed and dated October 25, 2011, changing from soldier course panel to the running bond pattern, as shown on Element 4 Front, marked as Exhibit B.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Absent: None

The motion carried unanimously, 3-0-0.

***Item #3***

Mr. Cocker stated that the third item involves the Element 5 Rear, and the only change here is flipping the door and window location in the rear of the building. He noted that the HDC's original approval included the removal of the awning and the inclusion of sidelights for the door, but the building plans have flipped the doors around so that the sidelights are in a different location than was originally approved.

Nancy Haynes, of 26 Great Road, asked whether it might be better to have different-looking doors, to have some variety. Mr. Cocker replied that he feels the doors within each element should be the same.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Carlson moved to accept Item #3 of the cover letter signed and dated October 25, 2011, for Element 5 Rear, to flip door and window as shown on Exhibit C and adding sidelights to the new door location.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Absent: None

The motion carried unanimously, 3-0-0.

***Item #4***

Mr. Cocker stated that the last item involves the balcony and columns on Element 7, which is the east end of the building facing Springs Road. He stated that this change is due to a simple error made when the architectural drawings were being created: the balcony from the Fletcher Road side of the building got copied exactly to this end of the building, but it actually was not supposed to. He noted that the site plan calls for a patio

area, but that area would be compromised if it had to support space for columns and a balcony. Mr. Cocker said they would like to remove those items from the Springs Road side of the building to allow more room for the patio. He added that the windows will remain, but due to a demising wall, the windows cannot be spaced equally and are, therefore, presented as two single windows and two pairs of windows. He remarked that the only other change here is that the roof pitch will be modified slightly so that it will not appear as the dominant roof.

The Board members and the audience conversed about this change, particularly the roof. Mr. Latady stated that since this is a side elevation, the change in the roof pitch does not affect the aesthetics of the building, because the difference in pitch won't be perceived the same way it would when looking at the structure from the front.

Ms. Dunham asked whether there is a sidewalk across the entire back of the building. Mr. Cocker replied that there is a sidewalk, although it does narrow for much of the area along the back.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Carlson moved to approve Item #4 of the cover letter signed and dated October 25, 2011, Element 7 East Building End, for removal of door on second floor and the windows together, and two windows abutted, as shown on Exhibit D.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Absent: None

The motion carried unanimously, 3-0-0.

Mr. Cocker noted that there is one final item he would like to discuss with the Commission: Bruce Blake and the team have decided it would be a nice touch to add a cornerstone to the building which reads "BLAKE BLOCK 2012." He said it would be at the front of the building, low to the ground, with a precast panel. He talked with the Commission and the residents in attendance about ideas for the cornerstone.

Miriam Brown, of 5 Great Road, asked whether the Commission knew of any other instances in the Historic District where there is a cornerstone like this. Mr. Latady said he doesn't know of any offhand, but he wouldn't be surprised if the fire station has one. Ms. Brown noted that she worries about this setting a precedent in the District. Mr. Latady said it would not be a bad precedent to set, as cornerstones like the one proposed are common on historic buildings and within Historic Districts.

Ms. Carlson said she likes the idea, although she doesn't know whether the Board can approve it tonight, as it wasn't advertised. After further discussion, it was decided that the Blake Block team will forward a proposal of the sketch to the Building Department

and to Mr. Moonan, and it will be decided at that time whether a formal vote needs to be taken.

**MOTION:**

Ms. Carlson moved to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Dunham seconded the motion.

Voting in favor: Carlson, Latady, and Dunham

Voting against: None

Absent: None

The motion carried unanimously, 3-0-0.

The meeting adjourned at 8:45 PM.

   
William Moonan, Chairman      Date

Respectfully Submitted,

Scott Gould  
HDC Assistant

Attachments:

Cover letter detailing Blake Block architectural revisions, signed and dated October 25, 2011